

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Final Office Action mailed April 6, 2007, which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

In the Final Office Action, claims 1, 3, 4-5 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,323,091 (Morris) in view of WO 00/77826 (Van Den Nieuwenhuizen). Further, claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Morris in view of Van Den Nieuwenhuizen and U.S. Patent No. 6,294,870 (Kawashima). It is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 3-12 are patentable over Morris, Van Den Nieuwenhuizen and Kawashima for at least the following reasons.

Morris is directed to a lamp having a cavity 50 formed in a press seal 42 shown in FIG 2. As recited on column 3, lines 42-45, an external ground plane 54 is attached to existing grounded frame parts allowing capacitive coupling between a foil 44 and the ground

plane 54.

Van Den Nieuwenhuizen is directed to a lamp that has a gas-filled cavity 10 in a collapsed seal 5. Two external antennas 45, 42 are provided around the collapsed seal 5. As clearly shown in FIG 1, and described on page 4, lines 22-23, the two external antennas 45, 42 are connected to an electrode 40 of the lamp.

In stark contrast, the present invention as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 3 and 9, amongst other patentable elements, requires (illustrative emphasis provided):

wherein said external capacitive body is
electrically isolated.


It is respectfully submitted that, Morris and Van Den Nieuwenhuizen, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest an electrically isolated external capacitive body. Rather, Van Den Nieuwenhuizen teaches an external capacitive body connected to an electrode. Further, the combination of Morris and Van Den Nieuwenhuizen, at best, teaches an external capacitive body connected to ground. Kawashima is cited in rejecting dependent claims to allegedly show other features and does not remedy the deficiencies in Morris and Van Den Nieuwenhuizen.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 3 and 9 should be allowable, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 4-8 and 10-12 should also be allowed at least based on their dependence from independent claim 1.

In addition, Applicant denies any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicant reserves the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703
Attorney for Applicant(s)
May 21, 2007

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101